

Comment on the proposed conservation of the specific names of *Aphodius rufus* (Moll, 1782), *A. foetidus* (Herbst, 1783) and *Aegialia rufa* (Fabricius, 1792) (Insecta, Coleoptera)

(Case 2878; see BZN 51: 121–127, 340–341; 52: 71–73, 123–125)

David Král

Department of Zoology, Charles University, Viničná 7, CZ-128 44 Praha 2, Czech Republic

I am in complete agreement with the application by Krell, Stebnicka & Holm. The authors have clearly and correctly presented the facts concerning this difficult problem and they have put forward the solution which serves stability in zoological nomenclature.

At least two of the species discussed, *Aphodius rufus* (Moll, 1782) and *A. foetidus* (Herbst, 1783), are widespread in almost the whole of Europe and adjacent parts of Asia and their names appear not just in taxonomic studies, but with increasing frequency, in ecological studies, local faunal lists, red data books, and the like.

I have given the Commission Secretariat a list of 10 additional references in which all the names are used, but I can supply 30 further citations if requested.

Alternative solutions mentioned, for example that in Dellacasa's second alternative (BZN 51: 340–341), even though perhaps formally correct, have been used only sporadically.

Comments on the proposed conservation of some mammal generic names first published in Brisson's (1762) *Regnum Animale*

(Case 2928; see BZN 51: 135–146, 266 267, 342 348; 52: 78 93, 187 192, 271 275, 347–350)

(1) Hugh H. Kolb

3 High Brae, Torphichen, West Lothian, Scotland EH48 4LX, U.K. (formerly of the Scottish Agricultural Science Agency, Edinburgh EH12 8NJ, Scotland)

I fully agree with the application to conserve 11 of Brisson's (1762) generic names for mammals and am happy to support it.

I note that the application (para. 5, BZN 51: 138) seeks the conservation of the name *Cuniculus* Brisson, 1762 for the South American pacas and that, if the proposal is not approved by the Commission, *Cuniculus* Brisson would be unavailable and the junior homonym *Cuniculus* Meyer, 1790 would become a valid name. Meyer's name relates to the European rabbit and would replace the well-known and universally used, but junior, name *Oryctolagus* Lilljeborg, 1874.

I worked on the rabbit for some years and have supplied the Commission Secretariat with a representative list of 11 papers (1985–1994) which demonstrate the usage of the name *Oryctolagus*. I am fully in agreement with maintaining the generic name *Oryctolagus* and would oppose any move to replace it with *Cuniculus*.

When there are no proposed changes in the taxonomic relationships of species, elevating precedence over usage in the choice of a name serves no purpose and merely causes confusion; this is especially acute if a name (in this instance *Cimiculus*) switches meaning.

(2) Peter Lüks

Naturhistorisches Museum, Bernastrasse 15, CH-3005 Bern, Switzerland

The spare time that I can devote to research on the Eurasian badger, *Meles meles*, is concentrated on morphology and ecology. I have little or no experience in taxonomy. I do not see any reason to change the authorship of the generic name for this taxon and I therefore support the proposal to keep *Meles* Brisson, 1762.

Comments on the proposed conservation of usage of 15 mammal specific names based on wild species which are antedated by or contemporary with those based on domestic animals

(Case 3010; see BZN 53: 28–37, 125)

(1) D.W. Yalden

*School of Biological Sciences, The University of Manchester,
3.239 Stopford Building, Oxford Road, Manchester M13 9PT, U.K.*

I write as the Managing Editor of *Mammal Review*. I must congratulate Anthea Gentry, Juliet Clutton-Brock and Colin Groves on a remarkably sensible and well argued case. The specific names discussed were, in most cases, intended to contrast the domestic animal with the wild one, or were coined to distinguish the wild animal from its previously known domestic relative. To attempt now to claim that the specific name of the domestic form is the correct name for its wild relative also is totally confusing, totally destabilising, and totally unhelpful. The contrast between *Canis lupus* and *C. familiaris* is well understood in popular as well as scientific writing, and in archaeological as well as zoological literature. The same contrast is equally clear when *Ovis orientalis* and *O. aries* are used. Using *aries* to include *orientalis* is undermining the well accepted nomenclature of the wild species, and I thoroughly deplore it.

I am enough of an archaeologist to understand the very real problem raised by the nomenclature of domestic animals, and can appreciate the difficulties that various attempts to derive a generally acceptable terminology have created. These difficulties in no way justify upsetting the one established and stable part of this problem (the names for the wild taxa), and certainly not doing so in a manner that will cause the maximum confusion.

I wish to support the very sensible proposal unreservedly in an attempt to maintain stability and clarity.

I trust that these authors or other interested parties will produce an attempt to stabilise the nomenclature of domestic animals in a similarly sane way, in the future and in a separate application, once this one has been settled.